

73rd MORSS CD Cover Page

UNCLASSIFIED DISCLOSURE FORM CD Presentation

712CD

For office use only 41205

21-23 June 2005, at US Military Academy, West Point, NY

Please complete this form 712CD as your cover page to your electronic briefing submission to the MORSS CD. Do not fax to the MORS office.

Author Request (To be completed by applicant) - The following author(s) request authority to disclose the following presentation in the MORSS Final Report, for inclusion on the MORSS CD and/or posting on the MORS web site.

Name of Principal Author and all other author(s): **MAJ Michael Armstrong**

Principal Author's Organization and address:

**Army Test and Evaluation Command
4501 Ford Ave
Alexandria, VA 22302**

Phone: **703-681-9295**

Fax: **703-681-3498**

Email: **michael.a.armstrong2@atec.army.mil_**

Original title on 712 A/B: **Capability Based Evaluations**

Revised title: _____

Presented in (input and Bold one): (**WG25**, CG____, Special Session ____, Poster, Demo, or Tutorial):

This presentation is believed to be:
UNCLASSIFIED AND APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 22 JUN 2005		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Capability Based Evaluations				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Army Test and Evaluation Command 4501 Ford Ave Alexandria, VA 22302				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES See also ADM201946, Military Operations Research Society Symposium (73rd) Held in West Point, NY on 21-23 June 2005. , The original document contains color images.					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UU	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 13	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Capability Based Evaluations



MAJ Michael Armstrong
Army Test And Evaluation Command



Why Capabilities Based Evaluation



- **January 2002 SEC DEF cancelled Missile Defense Operational Requirements Documents (ORD)**
- **New capabilities were taking too long to get in the hands of the soldiers**
- **Requirement were holding up fielding of needed capabilities in the field**
- **The complete T&E process was too long**



Impact On Change

- **Patriot Advanced Capabilities 3 (PAC-3) Initial Operational Test and Evaluation (IOT&E) was in its execution phase of testing**
- **Results of the IOT&E had to be briefed in two ways**
 - **Requirements Based**
 - **Capabilities Based**



Solution after Change

- **We realized two things:**
 - We had always done Capabilities Based evaluations but it was done at the decision maker level
 - Systems were bought with requirements not met
 - Systems were sometimes not bought with requirements met
 - Met and Not Met is what “went away”
- **We used the usual system measures and the answers became means of characterization**



No Requirements?

- **PAC-3 ORD cancelled**
- **Limited Guidance**
- **No examples for Capabilities Based Evaluations**

**System ORDs were the framework
upon which evaluations had been built**



Where is the Focus Today?

- **Capabilities – Main Focus**
- **Limitations – Limited**
- **Test Conduct - Limited**
- **Unknowns - Limited**



Operational Questions?

- **Is there a measuring stick?**
- **What is the minimum?**
- **Are there Thresholds?**
- **Are there Objectives?**
- **What is Spiral Development?**
- **What is the Block approach?**
- **What are Acquisition Increments?**



Operational Utility?

- **Does the soldier determine operational utility of the new capabilities ?**
- **Does the Program Manager determine the users needs?**
- **The user can understand operational utility only after he knows in detail the new capabilities being added and the limitations associated with those capabilities.**



Decision Time

- **What constitutes a capability?**
- **Is one new capability worth fielding?**
- **Is adding 10%,20%,30%... to current capability worth fielding?**
- **Who makes the decision on what is good enough?**



What Is Good Enough?

- **How do you measure when you have no measuring device?**
- **What will the measurement mean without a standard?**
- **Will the new capability establish a new standard or will each modification become its own standard?**



Informing The User

- **The User must know how:**
 - New capabilities impact operations (Operational Terms)
 - Limitations impact operations (Operational Terms)
 - Unknowns could impact operations
- **Who explains to the user how the capabilities, limitations and unknowns were demonstrated or tested**
 - Operational Testers/Evaluators?
 - Program Managers?
 - Contractors?

User involvement throughout Test and Evaluation Process



What is Important

- **What ever capability is fielded, we must keep in mind that the user is the soldier in the field. They must trust and know their equipment's capability in order to be successful on today's modern battlefield. We the test & evaluation community have a responsibility to inform the soldier in the field on the capabilities, limitations, and unknowns. It is up to them to determine when and where to use the new capability.**

Give the user the tools to make a informed decision.